



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2012

by P Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31 July 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/U1620/H/12/2170774

4 Eastgate Street, Gloucester, GL1 1PA

- The appeal is made under Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 against a refusal to grant express consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tom Wood against the decision of Gloucester City Council.
 - The application Ref 11/01147/ADV, dated 10 October 2011, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2011.
 - The advertisement proposed is aluminium signboxes, powder coated RAL 5022 (blue) acrylic face with vinyl logo, internally illuminated with HPF fluorescent tubes. Signbox to be RAL 5022 (blue), yellow/orange lettering RAL 1003. Illumination to be static. Signage to project approximately 200mm from shop front. 711 candelas per m/sq. Illumination to text and symbol only.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the sign on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Council has referred to policies in the Local Plan and to Planning Policy Guidance: *Outdoor Advertisement Control* (PPG19). The Regulations require that decisions are made only in the interests of amenity and public safety. Therefore, the Council's policies alone cannot be decisive, but I have taken them into account as a material consideration. PPG19 has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which is also a material consideration.
4. The Framework reinforces the importance of up to date plans, but also states that policies in a local plan should not necessarily be considered out of date simply because they were adopted before publication of the Framework. They may be given weight according to their degree of consistency with the Framework.
5. The Gloucester City Council Revised Deposit Local Plan was prepared prior to 2004. Policy BE.11 requires, among other things, that proposals for signs should be appropriate in design to the character and appearance of the building

and of the street scene and BE.29 applies this requirement to development in Conservation Areas. I consider that these policies may be given weight as they are consistent with the Framework. This states that poorly placed advertisements can have a negative impact on the built environment and that development affecting heritage assets, including Conservation Areas, should be considered in terms of its positive contribution to local character and the desirability of enhancing the significance of the asset.

6. The appeal site is a double frontage shop with a recently installed modern shop front. It lies within a Conservation Area and close to a number of listed buildings. The building is of two storeys, with a simple stone façade above fascia level which still expresses its original form as two separate buildings. It makes a positive contribution to this part of the conservation area, where many recent modern buildings have somewhat diluted the historic character and appearance of this central core of the City.
7. The Council refers to its Supplementary Planning Guidance *Shopfronts - Design Guidelines*. These are not before me, but it was apparent from my visit that although the style of nearby fascia signs varies, considerable restraint has been exercised over signage in this part of the conservation area. This is particularly so in respect of the size and simplicity of many of the fascias, their relationship with the upper floors and the scale of the company name. The Guidelines do not allow for illuminated signs in Conservation Areas.
8. The fascia sign has already been installed and extends across the full width of the shop. I consider that the internal illumination and the amount of signage, in terms of the repetition of the name and number of logos, are excessive and have a negative impact. The sign fails to respect the design, style and proportions of the building itself and the street scene in general.
9. I conclude that the sign is harmful to the visual amenities of the street scene and that it fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to local plan policies BE.11 and BE.29 and to the policies in the Framework.
10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR

If you require an alternative accessible version of this document (for instance in audio, Braille or large print) please contact our Customer

Services Department:

Telephone: 0870 333 1181

Fax: 01793 414926

Textphone: 0800 015 0516

E-mail: customers@english-heritage.org.uk